

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 06042 01 OF 02 061847Z

41

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 USIE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

INRE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 EB-07 ERDE-00 NRC-05

/095 W

----- 030832

O R 061622Z NOV 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 4446

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 6042

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJ: MBFR: OPTION III: EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS: SPC MEETING

REF: A) USNATO 5791 DTG 241050Z OCT 75; B) USNATO 5856 DTG
281558Z OCT 75

SUMMARY: SPC ON NOVEMBER 6 AGAIN CONSIDERED THE NEW UK APPROACH
TO EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS. MAIN DEVELOPMENT WAS FRG INTRODUCTION OF
A "COMPROMISE" TEXT, WHICH HAD THE EFFECT OF DEFERRING EASTERN
QUESTIONS RE US AND SOVIET EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS, BUT,
"IF AT ANY POINT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS" THE EAST ASKED FOR LIMIT-
ATIONS
ON NON-US ALLIED EQUIPMENT, THE AHG WOULD REPLY THAT SUCH LIMITATIONS
WERE UNACCEPTABLE. (NOTE: THIS WOULD MEAN THAT THE EAST WOULD
NOT EVEN HAVE TO PRESS FOR THE ALLIES TO MAKE THIS REPLY.) IN
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06042 01 OF 02 061847Z

RESPONSE TO US REP'S COMMENTS, FRG REP SAID HE WAS SURE THAT
FRG COULD ACCEPT RESTORING ELEMENTS OF THE PRESENT PARA 5
OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE INTO THE FRG "COMPROMISE" TEXT, AS
LONG AS THE ESSENCE OF THE PRESENT PARA 10 IS PRESERVED,

PERMITTING THE AHG TO MAKE THE NEGATIVE REPLY AFTER THE
POINTS IN PARA 5 HAD BEEN MADE. ACTION REQUESTED:
SEE PARA 10 BELOW. END SUMMARY.

1. CHAIRMAN (JUNG) ASKED FOR ADDITIONAL REMARKS ON THE NEW UK
LANGUAGE ON PARAS 4 TO 10 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, WITH RESPECT
TO EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS. US REP (MOORE) SAID THAT THE US
POSITION WAS AS STATED AT THE LAST TWO MEETINGS. CHAIRMAN
ASKED THE UK REP WHY THE SPC COULD NOT CONSIDER THE UK
APPROACH WHEN THE NEED AROSE, I.E. IF THE EAST ACTUALLY DID
REFUSE TO CONSIDER OPTION III IN THE ABSENCE OF INFORMATION
ON CEILINGS AND CONSTRAINTS UK REP (BAILES) REPLIED THAT
THE UK APPROACH SHOULD BE BUILT INTO THE GUIDANCE, TO ENABLE
THE AHG TO REACT QUICKLY IF THE NEED AROSE. CHAIRMAN SAID
ONE POINT FOR ALL TO CONSIDER IS THE AMOUNT OF TIME ALREADY SPENT IN
DEVELOPING PARAS 4 TO 10 TO THEIR PRESENT STATE, BUT THEN, TOO,
IT MIGHT BE WORTH WHILE TO CONSIDER THE UK APPROACH.

2. FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES WERE CONCERNED
THAT A COMPLETE DEADLOCK MIGHT NOW DEVELOP ON PARAS 4 TO 10.
THEREFORE, THE FRG WISHED TO PROPOSE A COMPROMISE, BASED ON
DEFERRING DISCUSSION OF LIMITS ON US ELEMENTS, BUT TELLING
THE OTHER SIDE AT AN EARLY POINT THAT THERE WOULD BE NO
LIMITS ON NON-US ALLIED EQUIPMENT. HE TABLED THE FOLLOWING
LANGUAGE FOR PARAS 4 TO 10.

3. BEGIN FRG TEXT

DRAFT GUIDANCE - EDRAFT OF PARAS 4 FOLLOWING

4. IN THEIR INITIAL PRESENTATIONS, THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS
SHOULD AVOID DISCUSSING THE ISSUES OF ARMAMENTS LIMITATION.

5. ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD STRIVE TO FOCUS DISCUSSION ON THE
BASIC ELEMENTS AS CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPH 1 ABOVE, AND SHOULD
RESIST ALL EASTERN ATTEMPTS TO DIVERT ATTENTION FROM THE
MAIN OFFER TO SECONDARY ISSUES. AS NECESSARY TO MEET EASTERN
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06042 01 OF 02 061847Z

PRESSURE, THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD MAKE CLEAR THAT
THEY ARE WILLING TO DISCUSS THE ISSUES OF WHAT US AND SOVIET
ARMAMENTS SHOULD BE LIMITED AND THE NATURE OF SUCH LIMITATION
ONLY AFTER THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REDUCTIONS HAVE BEEN THOROUGH-
LY EXPLORED. THEY SHOULD TELL THE EAST THAT THEY ARE NOT
WILLING TO GO INTO THIS DIFFICULT ISSUE IN ANY WAY UNTIL
THEY HAVE RECEIVED AN INSTRUCTED RESPONSE AS TO WHETHER THE
EAST IS WILLING TO CONSIDER POSITIVELY THE ALLIANCE OFFER AS
A WHOLE.

6. IF AT ANY POINT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS THE EAST ASKS FOR
LIMITATIONS ON ALLIED NON-US EQUIPMENTS, WHETHER GROUND,
AIR OR NUCLEAR, THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD ANSWER THAT

SUCH LIMITATIONS ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE TO THE WEST. THEY MAY ADD, AS APPROPRIATE, THAT THE ONLY ACCEPTABLE LIMITATIONS ON NON-US ALLIED EQUIPMENTS WOULD BE THOSE RESULTING (IN PARCTICE FROM COLLECTIVE LIMITS ON ALLIED AIR AND GROUND FORCE MAN-POWER IN THE AREA.

7. SUBSEQUENTLY IF THE WESTERN NEGOTIATORS, HAVING PROVIDED AN INSTRUCTED RESPONSE, PRESS FOR DETAILS ANDIF, IN THE JUDGEMENT OF THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS, THE RESPONSE SHOWS SERIOUS EASTERN INTEREST IN AN AGREEMENT INCORPORATING THE BASIC ELEMENTS AS CONTAINED IN PRARAGRAPH 1, THE FOLLOWING MAY BE OUTLINED IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING LIMIACTIONS:

- THE US NUCLEAR REDUCTIONS WOULD RESULT IN LIMITATIONS ON US NUCLEAR WARHEADS, US SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILE LAUNCHERS FOR BALLISTIC MISSILES OF OVER 500 KILOMETER RANGE, AND US AIRCRAFT OF NUCLEAR-CAPABLE MODELS.

- THE NUMBER OF EACH OF THESE US ELEMENTS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS COULD NOT EXCEED THE NUMBER IN THE AREA FOLLOWING PHASE I REDUCTIONS, WITH SUITABLE EXCEPTIONS TO PERMIT NORMAL TRAINING AND EXERCISES.

- AS PART OF THE DISCUSSION OF ARMAMENT LIMITATIONS, ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD ALSO MAKE CLEAR THAT THE NUMBER OF SOVIET MAIN BATTLE TANKS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS WOULD BE LIMITED TO THE NUMBER REMAINING AFTER PHASE I REDUCTIONS.

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 06042 01 OF 02 061847Z

8. IF THE QUESTION OF RECIPROCAL LIMITATION ON SOVIET NUCLEAR ELEMENTS IS ADDRESSED, THE ALLIES WILL SAY THAT THE SOVIETS WOULD NOT INCREASE THEIR NUCLEAR ELEMENTS ANALOGOUS TO THOSE (US) NUCLEAR ELEMENTS (WITHDRAWN BY THE US)(WHICH ARE LIMITED AS DESCRIBED ABOVE)(, IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO UNDERMINE THE BASIS OF THE AGREEMENT).

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 06042 02 OF 02 061856Z

42

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 USIE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

INRE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 EB-07 ERDE-00 NRC-05

/095 W

----- 030983

O R 061622Z NOV 75
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 4447
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 6042

9. IF THE EAST ASKS IF LIMITS WOULD BE IMPOSED ON US TANKS, THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD ANSWER, AS APPROPRIATE, THAT SOME CONSTRAINT ON THE LEVEL OF US MAIN BATTLE TANKS (- IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT US TANKS WOULD NOT BE INCREASED IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO UNDERMINE THE BASIS OF THE AGREEMENT -) COULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO THE WEST AS PART OF A SATISFACTORY PHASE I AGREEMENT.

10. IF THE EAST SEEKS STILL FURTHER DETAILS, THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD ANSWER, AS APPROPRIATE, THAT, CLEARLY, FURTHER DETAILS WOULD NEED TO BE AGREED, E.G., ON WHICH US AIRCRAFT MODELS AND SOVIET TANK MODELS WOULD BE SUBJECT TO THE LIMIT. ON THE FORM OF THE RECOPROCAL PROVISION AFFECTING SOVIET NUCLEAR ELEMENTS, ON EXCEPTIONS FOR TRAINING AND EXERCISES, ETC.END FRG TEXT

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06042 02 OF 02 061856Z

4. UK REP NOTED THAT THE FRG TEXT LINKED NUCLEAR ELEMENTS AND TANKS IN THE WAY IN WHICH THE UK HAD PREVIOUSLY OBJECTED. SHE SAID THAT THE GUIDANCE SHOULD NOT LINK NUCLEAR ELEMENTS AND TANKS IN THIS MANNER. SHE SAID SHE DID NOT WISH TO COMMENT ON OTHER ASPECTS OF THE FRG TEXT AT THIS TIME, EXCEPT TO SAY THAT SHE WELCOMED VERY MUCH THAT THE FRG WAS WILLING TO WORK WITH SOME OF THE UK LANGUAGE.

5. US REP SAID THAT IT WAS HARD TO SEE HOW THE FRG TEXT CONSTITUTED A COMPROMISE. THE FRG TEXT DOES GENERALLY MAINTAIN THE POSITION ON US AND SOVIET EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS IN THE PRESENT VERSION OF PARAS 4 TO 10 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE. HOWEVER, THE FRG TEXT TAKES SEVERAL STEPS BACKWARD WITH RESPECT TO NON-US EQUIPMENT. IN PARTICULAR, PARA 5 OF THE FRG TEXT WOULD HAVE THE AHG MAKE CLEAR THAT THEY WERE WILLING TO DISCUSS "THE ISSUES OF WHAT US AND SOVIET ARMAMENTS SHOULD BE LIMITED", AFTER EXPLORATION OF PRINCIPLES OF REDUCTIONS, WHILE PARA 5 OF THE PRESENT DRAFT GUIDANCE HAS A FIRST SENTENCE, OF FRG ORIGIN, WHICH THUS DID NOT HIGHLIGHT THAT THERE WOULD NOT BE LIMITATIONS

ON NON-US EQUIPMENT. IT TOOK CONSIDERABLE TIME TO AGREE ON THE FIRST SENTENCE OF PARA 5 OF DRAFT GUIDANCE. SIMILARLY, PARA 6 OF THE FRG TEXT STATES SIMPLY THAT "IF AT ANY POINT IN THE NEGOTIATIONS" THE EAST ASKS FOR LIMITATIONS ON ALLIED NON-US EQUIPMENT, THE AHG SHOULD ANSWER THAT SUCH LIMITATIONS ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE TO THE WEST. THIS DID NOT TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE US COMPROMISE LANGUAGE AIMED AT RESOLVING THIS ISSUE. (NOTE: PRESENT VERSION OF PARA 5 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE IS AS CONTAINED IN PARA 3, REF A, AS AMENDED BY PARA 1, REF B.)

6. FRG REP SAID HE ACCEPTED THE UK POINT ON LINKING NUCLEAR ELEMENTS AND TANKS, AND HE SAID HE COULD WITHDRAW THE PARAGRAPHS MAKING THAT LINKAGE IN FAVOR OF THE CORRESPONDING PARAGRAPHS IN THE PRESENT DRAFT GUIDANCE. RE US REP'S POINT, HE WAS SURE THAT AS LONG AS THE ESSENCE OF THE PRESENT PARA 10 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE IS PRESERVED, ENABLING AHG TO TELL THE EAST THERE WOULD BE NO LIMITS ON NON-US ALLIED EQUIPMENT AFTER THE POINTS IN PARA 5 HAD BEEN MADE, FRG COULD ACCEPT RESTORING ELEMENTS OF THE PRESENT PARA 5 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE INTO THE FRG COMPROMISE TEXT.

7. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) SAID THAT THE NETHERLANDS OF
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06042 02 OF 02 061856Z

COURSE IS STUDYING THE UK PROPOSAL, BUT THE MAIN DUTCH EMPHASIS CONTINUES TO BE GETTING EARLY SPC APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE BELGIAN REP (BURNY) EXPRESSED INTEREST IN THE FRG COMPROMISE TEXT.

8. COMMENT: THE FRG "COMPROMISE" TEXT, WITH RESPECT TO WHAT TO TELL THE EAST ABOUT NON-US EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS, IS A STEP BACKWARD FROM WHERE THE SPC WAS EVEN BEFORE THE US INTRODUCED ITS COMPROMISE LANGUAGE. IN PARTICULAR, PARA 6 OF THE FRG TEXT WOULD MEAN TELLING THE OTHER SIDE AT THE OUTSET, IN RESPONSE TO A SIMPLE EASTERN QUESTION, EVEN WITHOUT WAITING TO BE PRESSED, THAT THERE WOULD BE NO NON-US EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS. HOWEVER, FRG REP'S REMARK IN PARA 6 ABOVE INDICATES FRG IS NOT SERIOUS ON THIS POINT.

9. WE CONTINUE TO BELIEVE THAT THE US COMPROMISE OFFER, MADE BILATERALLY TO FRG, WAS A REASONABLE ONE,
XE. OFATKP AG ENT ON PXUKBIS)

OF THEJYKUWI # PAPER THAT THERE WOULD BE NON-US ALLIED EQUIPMENT REDUCTIONS IN MBFR, IN RETURN FOR FRG SUPPORT PARTICULARLY ON PARAS 3 AND 5 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE. THIS OFFER SHOULD MEET LEGITIMATE FRG CONCERNS, SINCE IT WOULD MEAN INTERNAL ALLIED AGREEMENT NOT ONLY THAT THERE WOULD BE NO NON-US ALLIED EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS, BUT ALSO THAT THERE WOULD BE NON NON-US ALLIED EQUIPMENT REDUCTIONS. WE AGREE WITH VIENNA THAT US SHOULD TRY AGAIN WITH THE FRG ON THIS OFFER.

END COMMENT

10. ACTION REQUESTED: IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 10: ANY COMMENT WASHINGTON MAY WISH TO MAKE ON
FRG TEXT.STREATOR

NOTE BY OC/T: SECTION 2 OF 2 NATO 6042; #SECOND PARA. 9. AS
RECEIVED. CORRECTIONS TO FOLLOW.

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 06 NOV 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: greeneet
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO06042
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19751189/abbrzmzv.tel
Line Count: 281
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) USNATO 5791 DTG 241050Z OCT 75; B) USNATO 5856 DTG 281558Z OCT 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: greeneet
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags: ANOMALY
Review Date: 02 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <17 SEP 2003 by greeneet>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: OPTION III: EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS: SPC MEETING
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006